

REMARKS

Claims 2 to 10 and 12 to 20 were pending in the present application. Applicant has amended claims 3 to 5 and 12 to 15.

§103 Rejections

Claims 2 and 12

The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,540,414 ("Brezina et al.") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,386,345 ("Matsuzaki et al."). Addressing claim 2, the Examiner stated that Brezina et al. discloses "a first housing (Figures 1-4 and 7, element 10) insert molded with the EMI shield (column 11, lines 9-51)." February 15, 2006 Final Office Action, p. 2. The Examiner rejected claim 12 for similar reasons as claim 2. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Brezina et al. does not disclose "an electromagnetic interference (EMI) shield" and "a first housing insert molded with the EMI shield" as recited in claim 2. Instead, Brezina et al. discloses an "electromagnetic interference shield 16 [that] is hollow, to allow the shield 16 to be slipped over the front end of the integrated optical coupler and housing arrangement 2." Brezina et al., col. 11, lines 17 to 19. Thus, EMI shield 16 is not insert molded with a housing as recited in claim 2.

Matsuzaki et al. does not cure this deficiency of Brezina et al. Matsuzaki et al. only discloses a "meshwork 7 [that] is secured to a rim of a housing 10 of electronic components." Matsuzaki et al., col. 3, lines 24 to 26. Accordingly, claim 2 is patentable over the cited references.

Claim 12 is patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 2.

Claims 3, 4, 13, and 14

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brezina et al. in view of Matsuzaki et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,738,265 ("Svarfvar et al."). Addressing claim 3, the Examiner stated that "Svarfvar teaches that an EMI shield comprises conductive shield sidewalls around a mesh (Figure 9, elements 46, 48, 50 and column 5, lines 42-67" and "contact fingers (Figure 19, element 226 and column 8, lines 49 - column 9, line 5) extending from the sidewalls. February 15, 2006 Final Office Action, p. 4. The Examiner rejected claim 13 for similar reasons as claim 3.

Applicant has amended claim 3, which now recites an EMI shield with "conductive shield sidewalls extending perpendicularly from a perimeter of the mesh." Amended claim 3. Svarfvar et al. does not disclose such an EMI shield. Instead, Svarfvar et al. only discloses a cavity 44 with walls 46, 48, and 50 that are insert molded with a mesh 42.

Fig. 9 shows ... a cover structure or housing shell 40 wherein the fiber mesh net designated generally at 42 is shown insert molded into a predefined interior cavity 44 formed by the wall 46 of the cover and internal walls 48, 50 of the inner side [of] electronic circuitry facing side 52 of the cover 40.

Svarfvar et al., col. 5, lines 44 to 50. Svarfvar et al. does not disclose that walls 46, 48, and 50 are conductive or that they extend perpendicularly from a perimeter of mesh 42.

Furthermore, Svarfvar et al. does not disclose an EMI shield with "contact fingers extending from the shield sidewalls" as recited in amended claim 3. Instead, Svarfvar et al. only discloses "a conductor end 226 received into an end 228 of a pin 230 and which pin 230 in turn inserted into an appropriate mating receiving connector 232 mounted on the printed circuit board 190." Svarfvar et al., col. 8, line 66 to col. 9, line 3. Accordingly, amended claim 3 is patentable over the cited references.

Addressing claim 4, the Examiner stated that "Svarfvar teaches that a housing is injection molded through the mesh of an EMI shield (Figure 17 and column 8, lines 5-24)" and "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Brezina with the injection molded housing of Svarfvar." February 15, 2006 Final Office Action, p. 5. The Examiner rejected claim 14 for similar reasons as claim 4.

Applicant has amended claim 4, which now recites "the first housing is injection molded through portions of the small openings in the mesh of the EMI shield and said at least one large opening remains unobstructed by the first housing." Amended claim 4. Svarfvar does not disclose insert molding through only portions of the EMI mesh. Instead, Svarfvar discloses insert molding the entire EMI mesh into the walls of a cavity. See Svarfvar et al., col. 5, lines 44 to 50. Accordingly, claim 4 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 13 and 14 are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claims 3 and 4.


Claims 5 to 9 and 15 to 19

The Examiner rejected claims 5 to 9 and 15 to 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brezina et al. in view of Matsuzaki et al., and Svarfvar et al., and further in

view of U.S. Patent No. 6,832,856 ("Chiu et al."). Claims 5 to 9 and 15 to 19 depend from claims 2 to 4 and 12 to 14, respectively. Thus, claims 5 to 9 and 15 to 19 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 2 to 4 and 12 to 14, respectively.

Summary

In summary, claims 1 to 20 were pending in the above-identified application. Applicant has amended claims 3 to 5 and 12 to 15. For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the claim rejections and allow claims 2 to 10 and 12 to 20. Should the Examiner have any questions, please call the undersigned at (408) 382-0480x206.

Certification of Facsimile Transmittal	
I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.	
 Signature	4/18/06 Date

Respectfully submitted,



David C. Hsia
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 46,235